DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 299 JC 880 606

AUTHOR Berg, Ernest H.
TITLE Accreditation Survey, 1987: Perceptions of Effectiveness and Usefulness, Opinions about Peer Review, Comments and Suggestions for Improvement.
INSTITUTION Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Aptos, CA. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 81p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Administrator Attitudes; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Institutional Evaluation; Organizational Objectives; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Trustees; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to assess the impact of accreditation on institutional members of the association. Questionnaires were mailed to the chief executive officers (CEO's) of all public and private two-year colleges in the region. The CEO's were to ask the chief instructional, business, and student services officers, the president of the faculty senate, the chair of the board of trustees, the self-study chair, and the accreditation liaison officer to complete the survey. The questionnaire solicited information on the accreditation experience of the respondents, the effectiveness of the self-study and team report in identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses, institutional changes resulting from accreditation, attitudes about the process, support for applying accrediting standards rather than institutional goals, satisfaction with the composition of peer evaluation teams, congruence between self-study and team reports, and recommendations for improvement. Selected findings, based on responses from 614 individuals at 135 colleges, included the following: (1) respondents felt that the self-study was a more effective indicator of institutional strengths and weaknesses than the team report; (2) changes initiated as a result of the accrediting process occurred most frequently in the areas of educational evaluation, educational planning, the library, goals and objectives, governance, and financial planning; and (3) 93% of the respondents agreed that the accrediting process maintains and enhances school integrity and quality. (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301299

ACCREDITATION SURVEY

1987

Perceptions of Effectiveness and Usefulness

Opinions About Peer Review

Comments and Suggestions for Improvement

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. C. Petersen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Ernest H. Berg

JC 880 606

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction		i
Abstract		ii
Chapter I	Purposes of the Study	1
Chapter II	Methodology of the Study	2
Chapter III	What is the Nature of the Accreditation Experience of the Respondents?	6
Chapter IV	Do the Self Study and the Team Report Effectively Identify Institutional Strengths and Weaknesses?	10
Chapter V	Does the Accrediting Process Result in Significant Change in the Institutions?	16
Chapter VI	What Attitudes Are Held About the Accrediting Process?	26
Chapter VII	Is the Accrediting Process Perceived to be Useful to an Institution?	32
Chapter VIII	What Support Exists for the Application of Accrediting Standards vs. the Institution's Own Goals?	36
Chapter IX	Are the Respondents Generally Satisfied with the Composition of Peer Evaluation Teams?	40
Chapter X	Is There Congruence Between the Areas Identified by the Self Study and the Team Report?	47
Chapter XI	Comments and Observations About Accreditation	55
Chapter XII	Summary and Conclusion	60
Chapter XIII	Survey Instrument	63

INTRODUCTION

In the belief that those who evaluate others should themselves be evaluated periodically, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges undertook a study of the impact of accreditation on those members of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges that are accredited by the Commission. Given the large investment of labor and resources by institutions undergoing accreditation, it is appropriate to assure that those efforts be well spent and that the processes of accreditation be assessed for effectiveness and usefulness.

The information and insights resulting from the study will be put to work to further refine accreditation through improvements in standards and procedures.

The Commission is especially indebted to Dr. Ernest H. Berg, Educational Consultant, who conducted the study, to Julie Slark, Director of Research and Planning at Rancho Santiago College, who provided data processing, analysis, and assistance throughout the project, and to Robert Jensen, Chancellor of Rancho Santiago Community College District, who provided support and encouragement. Others who offered valuable assistance and advice included Barbara Mertes, Charles McIntyre, Howard Simmons, and Patsy Thrash.

Survey No. 74 by the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education was the source of some of the questionnaire items. HEP permission to use selected items is gratefully acknowledged.

In designing the survey some use was also made of the earlier study conducted for the Western College Association by David Cole, former Chairman of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges. David Cole is a remarkable colleague whose encouragement and good example are greatly appreciated.

John C. Petersen
Executive Director
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

ABSTRACT

Chapter I: The Purpose of the Study

In general, the purpose of this research is to study the perceptions and opinions of administrators, faculty, and members of boards of trustees concerning many aspects of the accrediting process as currently conducted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The specific purposes are defined by the titles of Chapters 3 through 11.

Chapter II: Methodology

A questionnaire developed for the purposes of this study was sent to the chief executive officers of all public and private two-year colleges in the Western Region. The CEO was asked to have the chief instructional, business and student services officers, the president of the faculty senate, the chairperson of the board of trustees, the self study chairperson, and the accreditation liaison officer complete the survey. In addition, the CEO was asked to have the staff member most knowledgeable about the recent self study complete Part II of the questionnaire.

Returns were received from 135 colleges of which 19 were private institutions. A total of 614 questionnaires were returned. The data was analyzed at the Rancho Santiago College Research Center under the direction of Julie Slark.

Chapter III: What is the Nature of the Accreditation Experience of the Respondents?

The data indicated that CEOs had the most experience with accreditation and that other administrators had more experience than did the faculty. Many more of the respondents had experience with the institutional self study than had experience on an accrediting team visiting another college. For a number of reasons suggested in the study, CEOs were most often selected as visiting team chairpersons.

CEOs and VP/Deans from private colleges appeared to have had less experience with the accrediting process than did their counterparts from the public sector.

In general, the majority of the respondents appeared to have had varied but significant amounts of experience with the accrediting process.

Chapter IV: Do the Self Study and the Team Report Effectively Identify Institutional Strengths and Weaknesses?

The data indicate that a larger percentage of the respondents perceived that the self study was a more effective indicator of institutional strengths and weaknesses than the team report in all of the elements listed except the Educational Planning Process, and the Overall Competence of the Educational Leadership.

The range of percentages of the respondents who perceived that the self study effectively measured institutional strengths and weaknesses was from 80% to 41%. The same range for the team report was from 68% to 44%.

The elements which appeared to be the most effectively measured are: Library, Goals and Objectives, Comprehensiveness of the Educational Program, Physical Facilities, Counseling Services, and EOPS.

The elements which appeared to be least effectively measured are: System/District Relationships, Overall Competence of the Educational Leadership, Educational Evaluation, Financial Planning, and Overall Competence of the Faculty.

The data indicate that the self study and the team report are effective in measuring institutional strengths and weaknesses. However, the effectiveness varies greatly among the elements included in the study.

Chapter V: Does the Accrediting Process Result in Significant Change in the Institution?

The data from the public colleges indicate that institutional change occurs most frequently in the following items: Educational Evaluation, Educational Planning, Library, Goals and Objectives, Governance, and Financial Planning.

The institutional elements perceived by the respondents to have changed the least frequently are: Business Management, Financial Resources, Student Government, EOPS, District/System Relationships and Competence of the Faculty.

The data indicate a remarkable consistency of response by the position categories included in the study.

An interesting question is why in over 100 different public and private institutions the elements which were perceived to have changed most frequently are so similar. The study offers several possible reasons for this similarity.

The data from the private colleges is very similar to that of the public colleges. The Comprehensiveness of the Program, and Physical Facilities were perceived by the private college respondents to have changed more frequently than is the case in the public colleges.

In general, there appears to be agreement by the respondents that the accrediting process does result in institutional change but that change occurs most frequently in a limited number of the elements included in the study which appear to be very much the same for all institutions.

Chapter VI: What Attitudes are Held about the Accrediting Process?

The question in the survey instrument listed a number of statements often heard about the accrediting process. The responses indicated that in the public colleges there is a very large measure of agreement about those statements which were positive in nature. For example, 93% of the respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement with the statement that the accrediting process maintains and enhances institutional integrity and quality. Only 21% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that accrediting teams are biased against less traditional colleges. On a positive note, 92% of the respondents reported that they agreed that the benefits of accreditation outweighed the costs.

Private college respondents appear to possess less positive attitudes about the accrediting process than do the staff from the public colleges.

The data indicate that very positive attitudes are held about the accrediting process.

Chapter VII: Is the Accrediting Process Perceived to be Useful to the Institution?

This section of the survey instrument presents a number of potential uses of the accrediting process and asks the respondents to indicate whether they perceive them to be useful to the institution.

Almost all of the public college respondents indicated that the accrediting process is useful as a tool for self evaluation. However, only an average

of 69% indicated that accreditation is useful as a system of peer review. Only 52% of the faculty agreed with the statement. In general, faculty indicated that they perceived accreditation to be less useful to an institution than all other position categories.

Respondents reported that accreditation was less useful as a means of developing a collegial atmosphere in a college (67%), as a vehicle for career advancement for active participants (41%), as a source of low-cost consultation (61%), and as a criterion for eligibility for federal funds (51%). There was substantial agreement that all other items were useful to an institution.

The data from the private colleges indicates that respondents from that sector perceive accreditation to be less useful than do their counterparts in the public sector.

Overall, the data indicate that there is agreement among the respondents that the accrediting process is useful to an institution in a number of ways in addition to the certification of institutional quality and integrity. There is most agreement that the accrediting process is useful as a tool for self-evaluation.

Chapter VIII: What Support Exists for the Application of the Accrediting Standards V. the Institution's Own Goals?

The majority of the respondents from the public and the private colleges would place somewhat more emphasis on the institution's own goals rather than on the accreditation standards. In the case of the public college CEOs the difference is 56% to 47%. For the private college CEOs the difference is 55% to 45%. Similar differences were reported from respondents from other position categories.

Chapter IX: Are the Respondents Generally Satisfied with the Composition of Peer Evaluation Teams?

The data indicate that public college CEOs are generally the most satisfied with the composition of peer evaluation teams and that faculty are the least satisfied. Fifty-nine percent of the faculty indicated that they would increase the number of faculty members on teams. Smaller percentages of the faculty would increase the number of support staff, four-year college representatives, students, women, and members of minority groups. Forty-eight percent of the faculty would decrease the number of administrators on teams.

A minority of public college CEOs indicated that they would increase the number of support staff, women, and members of minority groups. They would, however, decrease the number of four-year college representatives, students, and representatives of the state system.

CEOs from the private sector appear to be less satisfied with the composition of peer evaluation teams than are their counterparts in the public sector.

There appears to be evidence that there is some dissatisfaction with the composition of peer evaluation teams.

Chapter X: What Significant Comments/Criticisms/Suggestions for Improvement are Offered by the Respondents?

The study includes many comments, both negative and positive, and suggestions for change. They are too numerous to be repeated here. However, it is obvious that the positive comments far outweigh the negative comments and that some of the suggestions are worthy of consideration by the Commission.

Chapter XI: Is There Congruence Between the Areas Identified by the Self Study and the Team Report?

This section of the questionnaire was identified as Part II and was completed only by one person at each college selected by the CEO as the person most knowledgeable about the self study and the team report.

In a comparison of the strengths reported by the self study and the team report, and of the weaknesses reported by the self study and the team report, a remarkable congruence was found for both the public and the private colleges.

Chapter I: PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The Commission believes that those who evaluate should themselves be evaluated. This then is the general purpose of this research--to evaluate several aspects of the accrediting process and to determine whether the process has a significant impact on the accredited institutions. Specifically, the study has been designed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the nature of the experience of the respondents?

2. Do the self study and the team report effectively identify areas of strength and weakness?

   (a) If so, does the process tend to identify a limited number of areas?

3. Does the accrediting process result in significant change in an institution?

4. What attitudes and perceptions are held about the accrediting process?

   (a) Do those attitudes and perceptions vary by position, category or experience?

5. Is the accrediting process perceived to be useful to an institution?

   (a) Is it more useful in some areas than in others?
   (b) Does the perception of usefulness vary by position category?

6. What support exists for the application of the accrediting standards vs. the institution's own goals?

7. Are the respondents generally satisfied with the composition of peer evaluation teams?

8. Is there congruence between the areas identified by the self study and the team report?

9. What significant comments/criticisms/suggestions for improvement are offered by the respondents?

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

For the purpose of surveying the largest number of individuals possible, a questionnaire was constructed to address the purposes of the study as listed in Chapter I. A number of items from the American Council on Education Survey of Presidential Views of Accreditation Issues (HEP Survey No. 74) were included in the questionnaire. Several drafts were prepared by the researcher and reviewed by Julie Slark, the Director of the Rancho Santiago College Research Center and by the Executive Director of the Commission. A final draft was sent to the following persons who reviewed it and made comments and suggestions, many of which were incorporated into the finished questionnaire which is included in this report as Appendix A:

Dr. Kay J. Andersen, Executive Director
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. James F. Bemis, Executive Director
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges

Dr. Barbara Mertes, Dean
Planning, Development, and Community Relations
South County Community College District

Gus Petropoulos, Assistant to the Chancellor
San Mateo Community College District

Dr. Howard Simmons, Associate Director
Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges

Jack Snyder, Dean (Retired)
Cabrillo College

James Stakkestad, Instructor of Mathematics (Retired)
Cabrillo College

Dr. Patricia A. Thrash, Director
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

The questionnaire was mailed to the chief executive officer of each of the two-year colleges in the Western Association with a request to have persons in each of the following position categories complete Part I:

Institutional Chief Executive Officer
System or District Chief Executive Officer
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Academic Senate or Faculty Council President
Chief Academic Officer
Chief Student Services Officer
Chief Business Officer
Governing Board Member
Self Study Chairperson/Coordinator

In addition, the chief executive officer was asked to have the person most familiar with the most recent self study complete Part II of the questionnaire.

An examination indicated that the composition of the public colleges responses differed considerably from that of the private colleges which included only one faculty and two trustee responses. Accordingly, it was decided to treat the two position categories separately and to include only the responses of the CEOs and VP/Deans in the private college tables.

It was also determined that the differences in the responses of the district and college CEOs and those of the chief college officers were probably insignificant. To simplify reporting it was decided to combine those position categories as follows:

Questionnaire Tabulation	**Study Tabulation**
System Chief Exec. Officer) College Exec. Officer)	CEO
Chief Academic Officer) Chief Student Services) Officer) Chief Business Officer)	VP/Deans

The following abbreviations will be used in the study:

Faculty Senate President	Faculty
Governing Board Member	Trustee
Accreditation Liaison Officer	ALO
Self Study Chairperson	SCC

Returns were received from 135 colleges of which 19 were private colleges. A total of 614 questionnaires were returned of which 497 could be identified as belonging to one of the four following position categories:

Position	Public	Private	Total
CEOs	102	20	122
VP/Deans	236	24	260
Faculty	67	1	68
Trustees	45	2	47
Total	450	47	497

The preponderance of response from public institutions (91%) reflects this accrediting association's membership. Four out of five member institutions are public community colleges. The balance are private junior colleges, special purpose institutions and military schools, most of them small in size.

In addition to the above, 117 respondents had been self study chairs and/or accreditation liaison officers. Thirty-seven of the respondents listed above were also self study chairs and/or accreditation liaison officers.

Position	Public	Private
Liaison Officers	79	8
Self Study Chairs	62	5

The accreditation liaison officers who could be identified held the following positions within the institution:

CEO	4
VP/Deans	33
Faculty	3

The self study chairs who could be identified held the following positions within the institution:

CEO	4
VP/Deans	12
Faculty	3
Trustee	2

Obviously, the staff members who were most often selected to be self study chairs or accreditation liaison officers were vice presidents or deans. It is likely that the CEOs who acted as self study chairs or liaison officers were from the private colleges.

To reduce the size of many of the tables the following abbreviations for the institutional elements will be used.

Abbreviations for Institutional Elements

a. College goals and objectives	Goals and Obj.
b. Comprehensiveness of educational program	Comprehensive
c. Educational program appropriate with community characteristics	Ed. Prog. Comm.
d. Overall competence of the faculty	Compet. Faculty
e. Overall competence of educational leadership	Educ. Leader
f. Educational planning process	Educ. Planning
g. Educational evaluation process	Educ. Evaluation
h. Counseling services	Counseling Serv.
i. EOP services	EOPS
j. Student government and activities	Student Govt.
k. Community services program	Community Serv.
l. College library and learning resources	Library
m. Other college learning resources	Learning Res.
n. Physical facilities	Physical Facil.
o. College business management	Bus. Management
p. Financial resources of the college	Financial Res.
q. Financial planning	Financial Plan.
r. Functioning of the governing board	Gov. Board
s. Role of faculty, staff, and students in governance of the college	Governance
t. Relationship of institution with system or district	System/Dist.

All tables will be reported as rounded-off percentages and, as a consequence, the totals do not equal 100% in all cases.

It is not intended that this report be a detailed statistical study of the questionnaire responses. Rather, the report seeks to convey the findings in a more general form which will be useful to the Commission in the review and revision of the accrediting procedure. The original data is available to anyone who desires to engage in a more rigorous analysis.

CHAPTER III: WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE ACCREDITATION EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS?

Public Colleges

Table 1 displays the percentages of respondents who have had experience with the accreditation process by type of experience and position category. It is evident that CEOs, VP/Deans, SSCs, and ALOs have had more experience than either faculty or trustees. However, faculty reported a significant amount of experience as members of a college committee preparing a self study. Also, a majority of the faculty respondents reported experience in participating in the writing of a self study. The responses indicate a significant amount of faculty involvement in the internal process of accreditation, and 16% of them indicated that they had served on an accreditation team at another college. That percentage indicates significant involvement because of the large number of faculty. The current efforts of the Commission have undoubtedly resulted in much larger numbers of faculty serving on accrediting teams visiting other colleges.

The SSCs and ALOs, in general, appeared to have had a significant amount of experience both internally and externally. Forty percent of the SSCs and 52% of the ALOs reported attendance at a WASC meeting exceeding all other segments other than the CEOs.

An obvious conclusion is that CEOs are almost always selected as chairpersons of accrediting teams visiting colleges. There are, undoubtedly, several reasons for this concentration. For example, CEOs have status which lends legitimacy to the process. Also, CEOs are able to assign assistants with less difficulty than would be encountered by others and CEOs have support staff at their disposal to assist in the preparation for the visit and the writing of the report. It is estimated that team chairpersons spend 8 to 10 days in completing their assignments. Obviously, faculty would have great difficulty in absenting themselves from their classrooms for so long a period.

TABLE 1
PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Types of Experience	POSITION					
	CEO	V.P./DEAN	FACULTY	TRUSTEE	SSC	ALO
a. Have chaired a college committee in preparation of self study.	63%	54%	39%	9%	95%	81%
b. Was member of a college committee in preparation of self study.	85	86	76	32	74	85
c. Participated in the writing of self study report.	85	82	53	25	97	91
d. Have been a member of accreditation team at another college.	95	48	16	21	55	69
e. Have chaired accreditation team at another college.	64	5	2	5	16	12
f. Have participated in specialized accreditation of college program.	36	19	11	7	17	16
g. Have served on accrediting body such as WASC.	10	2	2	9	0	5
h. Have attended meeting of WASC or an accrediting commission.	62	28	11	9	40	52
i. Studied accreditation process in a course in college.	37	24	17	9	24	27
j. Have participated in accreditation visit to secondary school.	23	12	8	5	14	13
k. Expressed written or oral opinions about accreditation process.	53	18	14	16	41	32
l. Served on governing board that approved self study document.	6	3	5	89	2	1

Although there is no substantive evidence concerning the point, it is possible that trustees, faculty, VP/Deans, and even some college CEOs from multi-campus districts, lack the breadth of experience required to serve as an evaluating team chairperson which is, by its very nature a responsible and demanding assignment. In many respects, the effectiveness of the accrediting process is dependent upon the competence and experience of the chairperson.

Although 89% of trustees reported that they had served on a governing board which approved a self study document, considerably fewer of them had actually engaged in the self study process. The self study process is a time consuming activity, and it is understandable that trustees, most of whom are employed, could not be fully involved. It is predictable, nevertheless, that trustees will, in the future, request a more active role in the process.

In general, the respondents appear to have had significant amounts of experience with the accrediting process. That experience serves as a validating factor for the findings of this study.

Private Colleges

As is shown in Table 2 the respondents from the private colleges have considerably less experience in the accreditation process than their counterparts from the public colleges. The numbers of faculty, trustees, SSCs, and ALOs are too small to be useful for analysis.

Only 32% of the CEOs from the private sector had chaired a college committee preparing the self study compared to 63% of the CEOs from the public colleges. Similarly, only 16% of CEOs from the private sector had chaired an accreditation team at another college compared to 64% of the CEOs from the public colleges.

Surprisingly, 44% of the CEOs from the private colleges had attended a WASC meeting indicating significant interest in gaining knowledge about the process. Also, 68% of the CEOs and 57% of the VP/Deans had been a member of a college committee in preparation of a self study.

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF PRIVATE COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Type of Experiences	POSITIONS	
	CEO	V.P./DEAN
a. Have chaired a college committee in preparation of self study.	30%	29%
b. Was member of a college committee in preparation of self study.	65	50
c. Participated in the writing of self study report.	45	38
d. Have been a member of accreditation team at another college.	40	13
e. Have chaired accreditation team at another college.	20	0
f. Have participated in specialized accreditation of college program.	30	4
g. Have served on accrediting body such as WASC.	10	0
h. Have attended meeting of WASC or an accrediting commission.	50	25
i. Studied accreditation process in a course in college.	25	13
j. Have participated in accreditation visit to secondary school.	15	0
k. Expressed written or oral opinions about accreditation process.	40	0
l. Served on governing board that approved self study documents.	40	8

CHAPTER IV: DO THE SELF STUDY AND THE TEAM REPORT EFFECTIVELY IDENTIFY INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES?

The effectiveness with which the self study or the team report reveal institutional strengths or weaknesses depends upon a number of factors. Neither report tends to raise new or surprising issues. Both reports tend to focus on exceptions, dealing more with aspirations and challenges than with matters that are not at issue. The composition of the self study team and the accrediting team may reflect sensitivity to a particular strength or weakness. It is possible that the Commission's published standards are more effectively related to some perceived institutional strengths and weaknesses than are others. Issues of the day may subtly effect both self studies and team reports as will the social, political, and economic environment in which institutions operate. Finally, the accreditation process has historically tended to focus on resources and processes and the concern for the assessment of both student and institutional outcomes is a more recent development. It should not be surprising to find that in the absence of effectiveness standards the self study and the team report would focus on the strength of the educational program and the competence of the faculty and the administrative leadership. All of these factors should be taken into consideration when assessing the effectiveness of the self study or the team report in identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses.

Public Colleges

Most community college self study committees spend a full year in the preparation of the report. Large numbers of the staff are involved in a careful self-examination of the institution guided by the standards published in the accreditation manual. The team report on the other hand is based upon a three-day visit to the institution by the accrediting team. The visiting team has, of course, the self study report as a source of information. Nevertheless, it could be expected that the respondents to this study would perceive that the self study would be more effective than the team report in identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses.

Table 3 displays the percentages of all public college respondents who reported that both the self study and the team report, the self study alone, the team report alone, or neither the self study or the team report effectively identified institutional strengths or weaknesses. The "Both" column is presented in rank order.

TABLE 3

PERCENT OF ALL PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT BOTH THE SELF STUDY AND THE TEAM REPORT, THE SELF STUDY ALONE, THE TEAM REPORT ALONE, AND NEITHER THE SELF STUDY OR THE TEAM REPORT EFFECTIVELY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES IN THE INSTITUTION

(Percents)

ELEMENT	BOTH	SELF STUDY	TEAM REPORT	NEITHER
Library	61%	19%	7%	14%
Goals and Obj.	60	21	8	10
Comprehensiveness	59	21	7	12
Physical Facil.	59	20	8	13
Counseling Serv.	51	23	8	18
EOPS	51	24	7	18
Community Serv.	50	20	8	22
Financial Res.	50	20	13	17
Governance	50	14	14	21
Educ. Planning	49	16	17	18
Bus. Management	47	20	13	20
Compet. Faculty	44	19	9	28
Student Govt.	44	22	6	29
Learning Res.	41	21	6	36
Gov. Board	41	16	17	30
Financial Res.	39	18	13	30
Educ. Evaluation	38	18	15	29
Educ. Leadership	38	15	21	27
Ed. Prog. Comm.	35	32	9	32
System/Dist.	32	12	9	47

It is apparent from Table 3 that the percentages in the "Self Study" column are considerably higher, with three exceptions, than those in the "team Report" column. The indication is that the respondents believed that the self study was more effective in measuring institutional strengths and weaknesses than the team report. It is understandable that the respondents probably experienced feelings of proprietorship about the self study and reported that it measured the listed elements more effectively than did the team report. Also, the respondents probably believed that a year-long study would measure the elements more accurately than a three-day visit.

The percentages listed in the "Neither" column indicate the extent to which the respondents believed that neither the self study or the team report accurately measured institutional strengths or weaknesses. The highest percentages were reported in the following elements:

System/Dist.	46%
Learning Res.	36
Educ. Prog. Comm.	32
Financial Plan	30
Educ. Evaluation	29
Student Govt.	29
Compet. Faculty	28
Educ. Leadership	27
Gov. Board	27

These findings indicate that at least one person in four believes that neither the self study or the team report is able to identify institutional strengths or weaknesses in the listed elements. It is possible that some consideration should be given to specialized training in the assessment of those elements.

Another way of looking at the effectiveness of the self study process and the team report process is displayed in Table 4. In this table the "Self Study Process" percentages were derived by adding the "Both" percentages and the "Self Study" percentages from Table 3. The total indicates what percentage of the respondents perceived that the self study process effectively identified institutional strengths and weaknesses. The percentages for the "Team Report Process" were derived in a similar manner. The percentages in the "Self Study Process" column are presented in descending order.

There is a clear indication that the respondents perceive the self study process to be more effective than the team report process in the identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses. In only Educational Planning, Educational Leadership, and System/District Relationships is the team report process perceived to be more effective than the self study process, and the differences in some cases may be insignificant.

In general, however, the data indicate that the self study and the team report are effective in assessing institutional strengths and weaknesses in most of the elements included in the survey but lower percentages were recorded for some elements. Those lower percentages may indicate a need for specialized training of evaluators.

Private Colleges

Table 5 displays the percent of private college respondents who identified institutional elements effectively addressed by both the self study and the team report, by the self study alone, by the team report alone, or by neither the self study nor the team report. For comparison this table should be compared to Table 4 which displays similar findings for public college respondents.

It is obvious that private college personnel did not believe the self study or the team report or both were as effective in identifying institutional strengths or weaknesses as did the personnel from the public sector. For the private colleges the percent range for "Both" is 53 to 14. For the public colleges that range is 61 to 32. For "Neither" the private college range is from 67 to 19. For the public colleges the same range is 47 to 10. The average percent of "Both" for private colleges is 38% and for public colleges 45%. For "Neither" for the private colleges the average percent is 34% and for public colleges it is 23%. The average percents are not shown on Table 4.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGES OF ALL PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT THE SELF STUDY PROCESS AND THE TEAM REPORT PROCESS EFFECTIVELY IDENTIFIED INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES
(Percents)

ELEMENT	SELF STUDY PROCESS	TEAM REPORT PROCESS
Goals and Obj.	81%	68%
Library	80	68
Comprehensiveness	80	66
Physical Facilities	79	67
EOPS	75	58
Counseling Services	74	59
Community Services	70	58
Financial Res.	70	63
Bus. Management	67	60
Ed. Prog. Comm.	67	44
Student Govt.	66	50
Educ. Planning	65	66
Governance	64	64
Compet. Faculty	63	53
Learning Res.	63	49
Financial Plan.	57	52
Educ. Evaluation	56	53
Gov. Board	56	57
Educ. Leadership	53	59
System/Dist.	41	50

TABLE 5

PERCENT OF PRIVATE COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO IDENTIFIED INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS EFFECTIVELY ADDRESSED BY BOTH THE SELF STUDY AND THE TEAM REPORT, BY SELF STUDY, BY THE TEAM REPORT, OR BY NEITHER THE SELF STUDY OR THE TEAM REPORT
(Percents)

ELEMENT	BOTH	SELF STUDY	TEAM REPORT	NEITHER
Library	53%	9%	17%	21%
Physical Facil.	53	16	7	24
Goals and Obj.	52	24	5	19
Comprehensiveness	52	15	14	19
Educ. Leadership	48	12	12	28
Educ. Planning	48	17	7	28
Compet. Faculty	45	21	9	24
Bus. Management	45	19	10	26
Educ. Evaluation	41	16	14	29
Financial Res.	41	24	9	26
Counseling Services	38	16	14	29
Community Service	36	10	7	47
Governance	35	16	7	43
Ed. Prog. Comm.	33	28	3	36
Financial Planning	33	28	10	29
Gov. Board	31	22	7	40
Learning Res.	28	16	12	45
Student Govt.	21	26	7	47
System/Dist.	19	7	5	67
EOPS	14	22	7	57

CHAPTER V: DOES THE ACCREDITING PROCESS RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN THE INSTITUTIONS?

Question 4 of the survey instrument asked respondents to indicate in which of the listed institutional elements change had occurred as a result of the report of the accrediting team. A rating scale was provided but for the purposes of this study the "Very Significant" and "Significant" responses were added and are referred to simply as "Significant."

The reported percentages are measures of the respondent's perceptions and are not intended to indicate a causal relationship. Obviously, institutional change occurs as the result of a constellation of causes. However, the consistency of response indicated in the reported percentages probably indicates that the team report was certainly an important factor leading to institutional change.

Public Colleges

Table 6 presents the percentage of public college respondents who perceived that institutional change had occurred as a result of the team visit.

Analysis is facilitated in Tables 7 and 8 which present the same information as Table 6 but places the percentages of respondents in rank order in decile ranges.

Although in Tables 7 and 8 there are differences in the rank ordering by the segments, the consistency of response is remarkable. The institutional elements in which significant change was most frequently perceived to have occurred are:

Institutional Element (all respondents)	Average Percentage
Educ. Planning	64
Governance	43
Educ. Evaluation	42
Goals and Obj.	42
Library	38
Financial Plan.	31

TABLE 6

PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO PERCEIVED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS HAD CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THE TEAM VISIT

Percent of Respondents

	SEGMENT					
Institutional Element	CEO	V.P./DEAN	FACULTY	TRUSTEE	SSC	ALO
a. College goals and obj.	43%	43%	47%	35%	33%	44%
b. Comprehensive	24	20	25	25	17	20
c. Ed. Prog. Comm.	30	26	25	32	16	21
d. Compet. Faculty	10	10	22	14	10	8
e. Educ. Leader	29	26	27	25	12	15
f. Educ. Plan.	73	64	59	61	52	61
g. Educ. Evaluation	46	44	36	43	35	36
h. Counseling Serv.	24	21	34	27	19	24
i. EOPS	12	18	23	14	14	8
j. Student Govt.	16	13	19	14	17	13
k. Community Serv.	22	19	30	25	24	19
l. Library	44	34	39	34	28	31
m. Learning Res.	23	24	36	25	24	23
n. Physical Facil.	25	21	28	25	31	17
o. Bus. Management	19	14	38	27	16	19
p. Financial Res.	18	11	25	21	16	20
q. Financial Plan.	35	31	34	25	29	41
r. Gov. Board	26	14	23	23	16	16
s. Governance	41	40	45	46	36	43
t. System/Dist.	24	13	16	23	16	7

TABLE 7

PERCENTS OF PUBLIC COLLEGE CEO'S, V.P./DEANS, FACULTY, AND TRUSTEES WHO PERCEIVED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS HAD CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THE TEAM VISIT
(Percentages in Deciles)

CEO'S	VP/DEANS	FACULTY	TRUSTEES
Educ. Plan 73			
	Educ. Plan 63		Educ. Plan 61
		Educ. Plan 59	
Educ. Eval 46	Educ. Eval 44	Goals/Obj. 47	Governance 46
Library 44	Goals/Obj. 43	Governance 45	Educ. Eval 43
Goals/Obj. 43	Governance 40		
Governance 41			
Finan Plan 35	Library 34	Library 39	Goals/Obj. 35
Ed Pro Com 30	Finan Plan 31	Bus. Mang. 38	Library 34
		Educ. Eval 36	Ed Pro Com 32
		Learn. Res 36	
		Couns Serv 34	
		Finan Plan 34	
		Commun Ser 30	
Ed Leader 29	Ed Pro Comm 26	Phys Facil 28	Couns Serv 27
Gov. Bd. 26	Ed. Leader. 26	Ed. Leader. 27	Bus. Manag 27
Phys Facil 25	Learn. Res. 24	Comprehens. 25	Comm. Serv.25
Comprehen. 24	Phys Facil 21	Ed Pro Comm 25	Finan Plan 25
Couns Serv 24	Couns Serv 21	Finan. Res. 25	Comprehens.25
Syst/Dist. 24	Comprehens. 20	EOPS 23	Phys Facil 25
Learn Res 23		Gov. Bd. 23	Ed. Leader 25
Commun Ser 22		Compet. Fac 22	Learn. Res 25
			Gov. Bd. 23
			Syst/Dist 23
			Finan. Res 21
Bus. Manag 19	Commun Serv 19	St. Govt. 19	EOPS 14
Finan. Res 18	EOPS 18	Syst/Dist. 16	St. Govt. 14
St. Govt. 16	Bus. Manag 14		Compet Fac 14
EOPS 12	Gov. Bd. 14		
Compet Fac 10	Sys/Dist. 13		
	St. Govt. 13		
	Finan. Res 11		
	Compet. Fac 10		

TABLE 8

PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE CEO'S, FACULTY, SSC'S AND ALO'S WHO PERCEIVED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS HAD CHANGED AS RESULT OF THE TEAM VISIT
(Percentages in Deciles)

CEO'S	FACULTY	SSC	ALO
Educ. Plan 73			
			Educ. Plan 61
	Educ. Plan 59	Educ. Plan 52	
Educ. Eval 46 Library 44 Goals/Obj. 43 Governance 41	Goals/Obj. 47 Governance 45		Goals/Obj. 44 Governance 43 Finan Plan 41
Finan Plan 35 Ed Pro Com 30	Library 39 Bus. Manag 38 Educ. Eval 36 Learn. Res 36 Couns Serv 34 Finan Plan 34 Commun Ser 30	Governance 36 Educ. Eval 35 Goals/Obj. 33 Phys Facil 31	Educ. Eval 36 Library 31
Ed. Leader 29 Gov. Bd. 26 Phys Facil 25 Comprehens.24 Couns Serv 24 Syst/Dist. 24 Learn. Res 23 Commun Ser 22	Phys Facil 28 Ed. Leader 26 Comprehens.25 Ed Pro Com 25 Finan. Res 25 EOPS 23 Gov. Bd. 23 Compet Fac 22	Finan Plan 29 Library 28 Commun Ser 24 Learn. Res 24 Couns Serv 23	Couns Serv 24 Learn. Res 23 Ed Pro Com 21 Comprehens.20 Finan. Res 20
Bus. Manag 19 Finan. Res 18 St. Govt. 16 EOPS 12 Compet Fac 10	St. Govt. 19 Syst/Dist. 16	Comprehens.17 Ed Pro Com 16 Bus. Manag 16 Finan. Res 16 Gov. Bd. 16 Syst/Dist. 16 St. Govt. 15 EOPS 14 Ed. Leader 12 Compet Fac 10	Commun Ser 19 Bus. Manag 19 Phys Facil 17 Gov. Bd. 16 Ed. Leader 15 St. Govt. 13
			EOPS 8 Compet. Fac 8 Syst/Dist. 7

The institutional elements in which significant change was least frequently perceived to have occurred are:

Institutional Element	Average Percentage (all segments)
Bus. Management	21
Financial Res.	19
System/Dist.	19
EOPS	17
Student Govt.	16
Compet. Faculty	14

Notwithstanding the consistency of response between and among the position categories, there are also some significant differences. For example, 26% of the CEOs, 23% of the faculty, and 23% of the trustees indicated that the operation of the governing board had changed as a result of the team visit. However, only 14% of the VP/Deans felt that such a change had occurred. Nineteen percent of the CEOs and 14% of the VP/Deans indicated that the college business management had changed. Thirty-eight percent of the faculty and 27% of the trustees felt that such a change had occurred. It is possible that such differences in perceptions of institutional change could be the result of "hoped for" change or a change which impinged upon one position category more than on others.

One indicator of the frequency of perceived change is the number of the 20 institutional elements which each of the position categories in Tables 7 and 8 listed below the third decile--indicating that it was perceived that those elements changed very infrequently.

CEOs	13	VP/Deans	14
Faculty	10	Trustees	14
CCSs	15	ALOs	14

This finding indicates that faculty listed the fewest elements below the third decile. Since faculty are usually considered to be the segment most critical of the accrediting process, it is somewhat surprising to find that they appear to perceive that institutional change occurs more frequently as a result of the team visit than do other segments--and specifically the CCSs and the ALOs who could be thought of as having considerable responsibility for and commitment to the process.

In the case of Educational Planning, 73% of the CEOs, but only 59% of the faculty perceived that change occurred as a result of the team report. Such a difference could indicate that although the process for educational planning changed in the institution, faculty still did not perceive that they performed a significant role in it.

In one sense the consistency of response is puzzling because it might be anticipated that the responses from over one hundred public community colleges would differ depending upon institutional characteristics, needs, and problems. The data, however, seem to indicate that the perceptions of the respondents of which institutional elements did undergo change were remarkably similar in all colleges.

There are several possible explanations for the pattern of responses to this item on the survey instrument. One might be that the elements which were perceived to have changed are the same elements perceived by the respondents to have been most effectively measured as institutional strengths and weaknesses in the team report. The following is such a listing:

Areas of Institutional Strengths and Weaknesses Most Effectively Addressed by the Team Report	**Elements Most Frequently Perceived to Have Changed As a Result of the Team Report**
Educ. leadership	Educ. Planning
Educ. Planning	Governance
Educ. Evaluation	Educ. Evaluation
Gov. Board	Goals and Objectives
Governance	Library
Financial Plan	Financial Plan

There does appear to be considerable congruence in the two lists which suggests that there is some relationship between those elements which are perceived to most effectively assess institutional strengths and weaknesses in the team report and those elements which are perceived to have changed as a result of the team report. There may be several possible reasons for the congruence noted above, such as:

(a) The orientation training for team members might emphasize certain institutional elements more than others and, as a result, team members may identify them more than others.

(b) The manner in which the accreditation standards are written may cause team members to emphasize some elements more than

others.

(c) Team members may identify some institutional elements as being those which are reasonably "safe" to mention as weaknesses because those elements are areas of weakness in most community colleges, including their own.

(d) It may be that some items are "trendy" at a given time period in the manner in which it recently seems fashionable to include something about student outcomes. That is not to say that it is not an important area of concern for all institutions.

Of course it is possible that most public community colleges do have weaknesses in the areas of educational planning and evaluation, governance, and financial planning and that the accrediting process, and specifically the team report, accurately identifies those areas.

It is also possible that although team reports do commend a number of institutional strengths and recommend change in a number of institutional weaknesses, in general format and context team reports tend to be similar, with elements such as faculty competence, administrative strength, and the strength of the educational program are frequently commended and elements such as educational planning, educational evaluation, goals and objectives, and college governance are frequently identified as weaknesses.

Nevertheless, because of the consistency with which the various position categories have responded to this item, it seems quite clear that the accrediting team report is an important factor in institutional change. However, those changes are perceived by the respondents to occur in a limited number of institutional elements which appear to be very similar in all institutions.

Private Colleges

Table 9 displays the elements of significant institutional change as a result of the team report as perceived by CEOs and VP/Deans.

Again, as is the case in the public colleges, items such as educational planning, educational evaluation, and goals and objectives are perceived to have changed most frequently. One element which is mentioned more frequently for private colleges than for public colleges is the comprehensiveness of the educational program. Since the private colleges tend to be more specialized than the public community colleges, this difference is

TABLE 9

PERCENT OF PRIVATE COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO PERCEIVED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS HAD CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THE TEAM VISIT

CEO'S		V.P./DEANS	
Library	68		
Educ. Planning	64		
Educ. Eval.	64		
Comprehensive	52	Educ. Planning	54
Phys. Facil.	44	Library	47
Learning Res.	44		
Finan. Planning	44		
Goals and Obj.	36	Phys. Facil.	38
Educ. Leader.	36	Comprehensive	35
Bus. Management	32	Goals and Obj.	32
		Governance	30
		Educ. Eval.	30
		Ed. Pro. Commun.	30
Governance	29	Educ. Leader.	24
Compet. Faculty	28	Finan. Planning	24
Community Serv.	28	System/Dist.	24
Financial Res.	28	Counseling Serv.	22
Counseling Serv.	28	Learning Res.	22
Student Govt.	24	Governing Bd.	22
Ed. Prog. Commun	20		
Governing Bd.	20		
System/Dist.	20		
		Compet. Faculty	19
		Community Serv.	19
		Bus. Management	19
		Financial Res.	19
		Student Govt.	16
EOPS	4	EOPS	3

understandable. Another item which is mentioned more frequently in the private colleges than in the public colleges is physical facilities which may be a greater concern in the private sector.

Table 10 and 11 display the most frequently changed and least frequently changed elements as perceived by the CEOs of public and private colleges. It is interesting to note that private college CEOs perceive that the competence of the faculty is more likely to change as a result of the team visit than are CEOs from the public college who rate that element as least likely to change. Private college CEOs are also less likely to be concerned about tenure considerations than are public college CEOs. However, in general, there is considerable congruence between the perceptions of change by the private and public college CEOs.

The findings appear to indicate that in both public and private colleges the team report is an important factor in institutional change but that some elements are perceived to change more frequently than others.

TABLE 10

MOST FREQUENTLY NOTED ELEMENTS WHICH WERE PERCEIVED BY PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGE CEO'S TO HAVE CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THE TEAM REPORT

PUBLIC COLLEGE CEO'S	PRIVATE COLLEGE CEO'S
Educational Planning	Library
Educational Evaluation	Educ. Planning Process
Library	Educ. Evaluation Process
Goals and Objectives	Comprehen. Educ. Prog.
Governance	Physical Facilities
Financial Planning	Other Learning Resources

TABLE 11

LEAST FREQUENTLY NOTED ELEMENTS WHICH WERE PERCEIVED BY PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGE CEO'S TO HAVE CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THE TEAM VISIT

PUBLIC COLLEGE CEO'S	PRIVATE COLLEGE CEO's
Community Services	Counseling Services
Business Management	Student Government
Financial Resources	Ed. Program Community
Student Government	Governing Board
EOPS	System/District
Competence of Faculty	EOPS

CHAPTER VI: WHAT ATTITUDES ARE HELD ABOUT THE ACCREDITING PROCESS?

Question 4 of the survey instrument asked respondents to indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with a number of statements about the accrediting process. Several of the statements concern topics which are dealt with in other sections of this study.

Table 12 displays the percentage of all public college respondents who indicated Agreement or Strong Agreement with the statements included in question 4.

Almost all of the responses reflect very positive attitudes toward and perceptions of the accrediting process. For example, only 4% of the respondents indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with item (a). Similarly, a very large percentage of the respondents indicated agreement with the following items:

(c) Self study identified college strengths and weaknesses.

(d) On-site visit identified college strengths and weaknesses.

(e) Self study and accrediting team discoveries are congruent.

(i) Benefits of accrediting process outweigh the costs.

(j) Accreditation orientation to college is useful.

(l) Composition of accrediting team is generally appropriate.

The identification of institutional strengths and weaknesses (item c), has already been considered in Chapter IV. However, the findings in that chapter indicate that some strengths and weaknesses appear to be more effectively identified than others.

The congruence between the self study and the team report (item e) will be considered in greater detail in Chapter X and the composition of accrediting teams is the subject of Chapter IX.

In item (b) 20% of the respondents indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement that the accrediting process results in frequent institutional change. That percentage would probably be somewhat lower had the word "frequent" not been included in the

TABLE 12

PERCENT OF ALL RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED AGREEMENT OR STRONG AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

	PERCENT		
	AGREE	DISAGREE	NO RESPONSE
a. Maintains and enhances institutional integrity and quality.	93%	4%	3%
b. Results in frequent institutional change.	78	20	2
c. Self study identified college strengths and weaknesses.	95	3	2
d. On-site visit identifies college strengths and weaknesses.	89	9	2
e. Self study and accrediting team discoveries are congruent.	85	11	4
f. Reports seldom result in negative action by Commission.	60	33	7
g. Teams frequently biased against less traditional colleges.	21	63	16
h. Team report frequently reflects attitudes of team chairperson.	21	66	13
i. Benefits of accrediting process outweigh the costs.	92	4	4
j. Accreditation orientation to colleges is useful.	88	4	8
k. Accreditation orientation to team members is useful.	77	3	20
l. Composition of accrediting teams is generally appropriate.	89	6	5
m. Reports may be distorted to serve institutions' special interest.	52	43	5
n. Standards should place greater emphasis on student outcomes.	72	22	6

statement. However, in Chapter V the findings indicate that the respondents perceived that some of the institutional elements were changed more frequently than others and that those elements that were perceived to have changed most frequently and those that appeared to be seldom changed appeared to be similar for all colleges. Those findings evidently warrant further study.

Only sixty percent of the respondents indicated in item (f) that they agreed with the statement "Accreditation reports seldom result in negative action by the Commission." Although there may be some question about what is meant by "negative action" there is an indication here that a relatively large percentage of the respondents believe that such reports are generally positive and that the Commission is reluctant to take negative action in those instances where institutional weaknesses are discovered.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with items (g) and (h) having to do with bias in team reports. A relatively large number of respondents indicated "No Response" and about one-fifth indicated agreement. Since positive responses to items (g) and (h) by a significant minority of respondents reflect some question about the objectivity of accrediting reports, this could be a matter of concern for the Commission.

Perhaps of greater concern to the Commission are the responses to item (m) which indicate that approximately one-half of the respondents agree that reports may be distorted to serve an institutions' special interests. There is little doubt that the respondents were referring to the self study report rather than the team report. It is possible that some college self studies tend to emphasize the positive elements of the institution and to fail to cite institutional weaknesses. It may be that the emphasis might simply be on certain strong or unique college programs. In any case, the responses to this item may indicate that visiting team orientation should prepare team members to look beyond institutional strengths reported in the self study.

The responses to item (n) concerning emphasis on student outcomes are of interest. Considering the amount of attention being directed toward the assessment of student outcomes, it might have been anticipated that there would be greater agreement with the statement. One reason for this lack of greater agreement could be that colleges have experienced considerable difficulty in assessing student outcomes. Indeed, there appears to be a lack of agreement on exactly what student outcomes should be. A second reason may be that there is some agreement that the accrediting process should continue to be based upon the more traditional standards which have been included for many years.

Table 13 displays the public college responses to the statements concerning the accrediting process. In general, the responses of the faculty appear to reflect a less positive attitude toward the process than do the responses from the other position categories. The responses of the CEOs reflect a more positive attitude toward the process than do the responses of the other position categories. Since CEOs, in general, have had the most experience with the accrediting process, there is additional support for the proposition that the greater the amount of experience with the process, the more positive the attitudes toward it.

In one item, however, the CEOs appear to question the process more than the other position categories, and that is with respect to the possible team bias against less traditional colleges. Because CEOs are usually selected as team chairpersons, it may be that some measure of bias actually exists and is not detected or recognized by other segments represented on accrediting teams. The elimination of that bias may be a subject to be considered in team member orientation.

In item (b) CEOs appear to be more positive than other position categories that institutional change occurs as a result of the accrediting process. Although there may be some evidence here of wishful thinking, the broader perspective of the chief executive officer may be a valid indication of actual change.

In item (k) the low percentage of positive response by the faculty undoubtedly reflects the relatively large "No Response" referred to in the discussion of the previous table. Certainly, many of the faculty would not have had the opportunity to participate in team member orientation sessions.

In item (n) both VP/Deans and Faculty indicated greater interest in placing greater emphasis on student outcomes than did the CEOs and trustees. Perhaps the lack of greater support by those two position categories is part of the reason for the lack of progress toward the assessment of student outcomes.

Although the responses to a few of the items included in this question may be of some concern to the Commission, in general the responses indicate very positive opinions about and attitudes toward the accrediting process.

TABLE 13

PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED AGREEMENT OR STRONG AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

	STRONGLY AGREE OR AGREE (Percent of Respondents)					
	SEGMENTS					
	CEO	V.P./DEAN	FACULTY	TRUSTEE	SSC	ALO
a. Maintains and enhances institutional integrity and quality.	96%	93%	91%	88%	84%	94%
b. Results in frequent institutional change.	90	72	72	75	76	81
c. Self study identifies college strengths and weaknesses.	96	94	91	93	92	93
d. On-site visit identifies college strengths and weaknesses.	92	86	93	93	88	90
e. Self study and accrediting team discoveries are congruent.	90	86	74	86	90	89
f. Reports seldom result in negative action by Commission.	55	61	58	59	63	55
g. Teams frequently biased against less traditional colleges	31	20	20	12	15	22
h. Team report frequently reflects attitudes of team chairperson.	21	21	22	18	34	22
i. Benefits of accrediting process outweighs the costs.	98	90	89	91	90	90
j. Accreditation orientation to college is useful.	94	89	78	82	88	94
k. Accreditation orientation to team members is useful.	93	80	48	76	76	84
l. Composition of accrediting team is generally appropriate.	95	92	75	87	86	95
m. Reports may be distorted to serve institutions' special interest.	52	52	61	46	52	44
n. Standards should place greater emphasis on student outcomes.	67	75	73	66	64	68

TABLE 13A

PERCENT OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGE CEO'S AND V.P./DEANS WHO INDICATED AGREEMENT OR STRONG AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

	STRONGLY AGREE OR AGREE (Percent of Respondents)			
	SEGMENTS			
	CEO PRIV.	CEO PUB.	V.P/DEAN PRIV.	V.P/DEAN PUB.
a. Maintains and enhances institutional integrity and quality.	84%	96%	88%	93%
b. Results in frequent institutional change.	75	90	71	72
c. Self study identifies college strengths and weaknesses.	90	96	87	94
d. On-site visit identifies college strengths and weaknesses.	85	92	74	86
e. Self study and accrediting team discoveries are congruent.	85	90	54	86
f. Reports seldom result in negative action by Commission.	50	55	42	61
g. Teams frequently biased against less traditional colleges.	40	31	21	20
h. Team report frequently reflects attitudes of team chairperson.	5	21	8	21
i. Benefits of accrediting process outweighs the costs.	75	98	75	90
j. Accreditation orientation to colleges is useful.	80	94	73	89
k. Accreditation orientation to team members is useful.	70	93	46	80
l. Composition of accrediting team is generally appropriate.	85	95	67	92
m. Reports may be distorted to serve institutions' special interest.	45	52	17	52
n. Standards should place greater emphasis on student outcomes.	65	67	46	75

CHAPTER VII: IS THE ACCREDITING PROCESS PERCEIVED TO BE USEFUL TO AN INSTITUTION?

The findings reported in Chapter VI have indicated that perceptions of and opinions about the accrediting process as measure of institutional quality and integrity are very positive. This chapter examined several other ways in which the accrediting process is useful to an institution. The public college position category responses are displayed in Table 14. Even a cursory examination reveals that the process is regarded as useful to institutions in many ways.

The responses to item (b) appear to be considerably lower than anticipated, and the faculty responses are considerably lower than those of other segments. Accreditation is often referred to as a system of peer review. However, if each position category considered "peer" is to include only persons of that particular segment, the low percentage response is partially understandable. It may be that the faculty's concern about the composition of accrediting teams is operative in their responses. It should be noted that to faculty "peer review" typically means performance evaluation by colleagues, so there may have been some confusion created by the wording of this item. Nevertheless, the responses to this item warrant further study and consideration by the Commission.

Although in some cases the differences are small, it is noteworthy that faculty have indicated that the accrediting process is less useful than have the other segments. It is difficult to understand why the faculty have indicated in item (d) less usefulness as a means to develop knowledge and understanding of the accreditation process. It might be expected that experience with the process would lead to increases in knowledge and understanding. Similarly, faculty have indicated less usefulness in item (i) which is concerned with the process as a means of in-service experience. A possible explanation might be that a portion of the faculty still believe that the accrediting process is largely under the control of the administrators of the institution and of the accrediting team.

One of the highest percentages recorded by the faculty, and in item (g), the highest percentage recorded by any segment, indicated that the accreditation process is useful as a means of clarifying college and/or program goals. This, along with other findings, appears to be an indication that although faculty perceive the accrediting process to be potentially valid and useful, they do have concerns about its implementation.

TABLE 14

PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE USEFULNESS TO INSTITUTIONS OF THE ACCREDITING PROCESS
(Percents)

	SEGMENTS					
	CEO	V/P DEAN	FACULTY	TRUSTEE	SSC	ALO
a. As a tool for college self-evaluation.	99%	99%	94%	96%	93%	97%
b. As a system of peer review.	75	70	52	72	71	75
c. Increasing knowledge and understanding of accreditation process.	92	83	73	87	90	85
d. Develop acceptance of usefulness of standards for accreditation.	93	83	79	84	78	81
e. Accept standards as valid measures of institutional quality.	93	82	78	82	81	89
f. Institutional standards recognized by postsecondary community.	96	93	92	86	93	93
g. As a means of clarifying college and/or program goals.	89	92	94	91	93	84
h. As a stimulus for improvement of programs and services.	96	93	94	86	90	92
i. As an in-service experience for administrators and staff.	90	83	70	84	83	77
j. Achieving consensus among various elements of the college.	83	75	56	75	72	70
k. Developing collegial atmosphere in the college.	73	66	66	57	75	66
l. As a means of professional development for active participants.	91	86	70	87	81	83
m. As a vehicle for career enhancement for active participants.	44	41	31	59	38	35
n. As a source of low-cost consultation.	61	65	61	66	55	55
o. As a criterion for eligibility for federal funds.	65	48	43	63	42	47

It is often heard that the self study process increases understanding among the position categories and is a unifying force within the institution. Item (j) indicates that most CEOs, VP/Deans, and trustees agree that this happens. However, little more than half of the faculty would agree. There is in item (k) more agreement that the self study process results in the development of a collegial atmosphere within an institution. In this case, however, the trustees, who view the process from outside the institution, are less certain that collegiality is enhanced.

Except for trustees, there appears to be little agreement that participation in accreditation activity is a vehicle for career enhancement for active participants. Although no substantial evidence can be cited, it is believed by many that personnel who have participated actively in the accrediting process develop a much broader perspective of higher education as a whole which sometimes leads to career advancement.

Since one of the requirements for the receipt of federal funds is accreditation by a regional agency, it is difficult also to understand the low percentages in item (o). Perhaps those percentages indicate that although there is universal knowledge that accreditation is the sine qua non where federal funds are concerned, there is less agreement that this should be the case.

In general, although some segmental differences exist, the responses to the question posed in this chapter indicates that the accrediting process is useful to institutions in a number of quite important ways. There is also some evidence that perceptions of usefulness vary directly with experience with the process.

Private Colleges

Table 15 displays a comparison of the responses of public and private college CEOs and VP/Deans concerning the usefulness to the institution of the accrediting process. In almost every category of usefulness more public than private college administrators perceived the accrediting process to be useful to an institution. Private college CEOs and VP/Deans indicated that the accrediting process was useful in clarifying college goals and in improving programs. However, in the areas of in-service experience, achieving consensus, and in developing a collegial atmosphere their perceptions of usefulness were significantly lower than those of their public college counterparts. Collegiality and the achievement of consensus may be a lesser issue in the private colleges surveyed than in the public colleges.

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGE CEO'S AND VP/DEANS CONCERNING THE USEFULNESS TO INSTITUTIONS OF THE ACCREDITING PROCESS
(Percents)

Useful as:	CEO's		VP/Deans	
	Private	Public	Private	Public
a. Self-evaluation	95%	99%	91%	99%
b. Peer review	70	75	65	70
c. Increase knowledge	90	92	88	83
d. Acceptance of Standards	80	93	75	83
e. Measure of Quality	80	93	83	82
f. Recognition	90	96	92	93
g. Clarify goals	90	89	83	94
h. Improve programs	90	96	88	94
i. In-service experience	65	90	71	83
j. Achieving consensus	65	83	67	75
k. Collegial atmosphere	30	73	48	66
l. Professional development	70	91	83	86
m. Career enhancement	37	44	48	41
n. Low cost consultation	60	61	54	65
o. Federal funds	74	65	54	65

The comparison of the public and private college responses appears to provide additional evidence that experience with and knowledge about the accrediting process results in more positive perceptions of the process.

The findings in this chapter suggest that the Commission may not have been sufficiently active in assisting the private sector to achieve a thorough understanding of the processes and principles of accreditation. Attention to better communication and greater involvement may be advisable.

CHAPTER VIII: WHAT SUPPORT EXISTS FOR THE APPLICATION OF ACCREDITING STANDARDS VS. THE INSTITUTION'S OWN GOALS?

An institution is evaluated in terms of accreditation standards in the special context of its own unique published goals. What relative weight is appropriately assigned to external and internal standards? The question of whether the accrediting standards or the institution's own goals should take precedence has been a matter of concern for a number of years. On the one hand a strong case can be made for the situation in which every accredited college met all of the standards agreed upon by members of a voluntary association. In that situation there would be ample assurance that all accredited colleges possessed equally high standards of quality and integrity. On the other hand an equally strong case can be made for a less slavish adherence to the accrediting standards to permit colleges to approach their missions with originality and creativity. For many years the accrediting commissions, with some success, have steered a course between Scylla and Charybdis. The purpose of this chapter is to determine whether those who participate in the accrediting process would prefer to emphasize the accrediting standards or the institution's own goals.

Table 16 displays the public college responses by segment in decile ranges and the average percentage for each segment. The modal range for both Accreditation Standards and for College Goals is 41-50%. However, for the Accreditation Standards the responses expressed as percentages cluster below the modal range and for the Institution's Own Goals above the modal range. This distribution and the average percentages indicate that there is definite but modest preference for placing more emphasis on the institution's own goals rather than on the accreditation standards. Any effort to further quantify the degree of preference would not be useful for

TABLE 16

PROPORTIONS OF EMPHASIS WHICH SHOULD BE GIVEN TO ACCREDITATION STANDARDS VERSUS COLLEGE GOALS
(Public College by Segment)

	POSITIONS					
	CEO	V.P./DEAN	FACULTY	TRUSTEE	SSC	ALO
ACCREDITATION STANDARDS						
0-10%	5%	4%	2%	3%	4%	3%
11-20%	7	6	6	3	0	4
21-30%	21	20	19	17	12	17
31-40%	18	18	17	17	19	26
41-50%	30	26	26	36	29	26
51-60%	6	13	11	6	12	6
61-70%	7	3	9	6	10	4
71-80%	7	8	6	14	14	7
81-90%	0	1	4	0	2	3
91-100%	1	1	0	0	0	3
AVERAGE PERCENT	47	50	51	49	53	48
COLLEGE GOALS						
0-10%	1	1	6	0	2	6
11-20%	3	2	2	8	12	6
21-30%	9	8	9	8	12	6
31-40%	7	13	15	8	12	6
41-50%	28	25	26	33	27	26
51-60%	17	18	13	19	17	23
61-70%	13	10	11	8	12	10
71-80%	17	17	17	11	4	15
81-90%	3	4	0	3	4	3
91-100%	1	1	2	0	0	0
AVERAGE PERCENT	56	54	60	64	57	59

the purposes of this study. Indeed, even with more precise information, it is difficult to foresee how the Commission could implement that preference other than by giving very general direction to accrediting teams. It appears that the Commission must continue seeking a safe course between the whirlpool and the rock.

Although the average percentages are very similar for all segments, there does appear to be a more pronounced preference for the institution's own goals on the part of the trustees and to a lesser extent, the faculty and ALOs. On the basis of the very limited information available from the average percentages at the bottom of the table, it might be postulated that there appears to be a weak inverse relationship between knowledge of and experience with accreditation and preference for the institution's own goals.

Table 17 displays the responses of private college CEOs and VP/Deans expressed in percentages in decile ranges. Although it might have been anticipated that private college administrators would have expressed greater preference for their institutions' own goals because those institutions are more specialized than the public community colleges, that does not appear to be the case. The distribution of percentages and the magnitude of the average percentages is very similar. The proposition of the inverse relationship referred to above is not supported by the private college responses.

* *

The overall conclusion is that both private and public college segments indicate a modest preference for the institution's own goals rather than the accreditation standards.

TABLE 17

PROPORTION OF EMPHASIS WHICH SHOULD BE GIVEN TO
ACCREDITATION STANDARDS VERSUS COLLEGE GOALS
(Private College by Segment)

	POSITIONS	
	CEO	V.P./DEAN
ACCREDITATION STANDARDS		
0-10%	4%	3%
11-20%	4	0
21-30%	17	13
31-40%	25	29
41-50%	33	36
51-60%	4	13
61-70%	0	0
71-80%	13	7
81-90%	0	0
91-100%	0	0
AVERAGE PERCENT	45	47
COLLEGE GOALS		
0-10%	0	0
11-20%	4	3
21-30%	8	3
31-40%	4	10
41-50%	33	36
51-60%	25	32
61-70%	13	7
71-80%	8	7
81-90%	4	3
91-100%	0	0
AVERAGE PERCENT	55	57

CHAPTER IX: ARE THE RESPONDENTS GENERALLY SATISFIED WITH THE COMPOSITION OF PEER EVALUATION TEAMS?

An important element in the character of institutional accreditation and in the composition of peer evaluation teams is the dependence on volunteers. Evaluation team chairs and members of the Commission itself all serve without compensation other than reimbursement for necessary expenses of participation. Their duties are demanding and the hours long, yet the supply of professional volunteers far exceed the number of positions available. Distinguished professionals and the institutions that employ them provide services of inestimable value out of a sense of professional obligation. Accreditation is uniquely and admirably professional in character.

The composition of accrediting teams has undergone change over the past few years. During 1987-88 actual team composition was 43% women, 31.5% members of minority groups, and 28% faculty. Each team includes a chief executive officer, a chief academic officer, a chief student services officer, and in California one member of the Chancellor's staff and occasionally a member of the Board of Governors. It is also desirable to include a vocational education administrator, a business officer, a trustee, and three or four faculty members. The historic dependency of institutional accreditation on experienced faculty and academic administrators with broad institutional experience has been considered to be practical, economical, and effective.

There are sometimes requests to include several kinds of specialists such as librarians, counselors, basic skills specialists and classified staff. It is also possible to include students upon request although none have been assigned to teams in recent years. To prevent teams from becoming too unwieldy, and to keep expenses at a reasonable level, the major effort by the Commission has been to depend upon generalists and to encourage colleges to involve many types of specialists in the institutional self study.

Table 18 displays the responses of all respondents concerning the composition of accrediting teams. Except in the case of the number of lay persons on teams, well over half of the respondents would make no change. Significant numbers of the respondents would increase the number of faculty, support staff, four-year college representatives, students, women, and members of minority groups. On the other hand, significant numbers of the respondents would decrease the number of four-year college representatives, lay persons, state system staff, and students.

TABLE 18

PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING
COMPOSITION OF ACCREDITING TEAM
(Percents)

	KEEP THE SAME	INCREASE	DECREASE	NO RESPONSE
a. Administrators	77%	5%	7%	11%
b. Faculty	65	22	2	11
c. Support staff	61	25	2	12
d. Governing Board Members	70	8	9	13
e. Four-year college reps.	50	13	21	17
f. Laypersons	49	8	25	18
g. State system staff	64	4	18	14
h. Students	53	18	12	17
i. Women	65	18	1	17
j. Members of minority groups	56	28	1	16
k. Others	10	5	1	85

More of the respondents would decrease rather than increase the number of four-year representatives and more of the respondents would increase rather than decrease the number of students on teams.

The differences in the opinions of the various position categories regarding the composition of accrediting teams can be seen in Table 19.

Only 11% of the CEOs would increase the number of faculty members on teams. On the other hand, 59% of the faculty would increase such membership. Only 1% of the CEOs would decrease the number of administrators on teams but 36% of faculty would do so.

Eight percent of the CEOs and 6% of the faculty would increase the number of board members on teams. Twenty-three percent of board members would increase their own numbers on teams.

Thirty percent of CEOs would decrease the number of four-year college representatives. Twenty-five percent of the faculty would increase that representation.

Thirty-one percent of faculty would increase the number of students. Twenty-three percent of CEOs would decrease the student representation.

Twenty percent of CEOs and 27% of faculty would increase the number of women on teams. Only 7% of board members would do so. There is more agreement among the position categories that the numbers of minority groups members should be increased.

Twenty-five percent of self study chairs indicated that the number of administrators should be decreased and 38% indicated that the number of faculty should be increased. Only 4% of the accreditation liaison officers would decrease the number of administrators but 24% would increase the number of faculty.

Although satisfaction with the composition of accrediting teams by all respondents ranges from 49% to 70%, there appears to be a significant amount of dissatisfaction among the position categories. In most cases the dissatisfaction arises from segments which would like to have their own representation increased, sometimes with a reduction in other segments. Except for board members there appears to be significant agreement that the number of women and members of minority groups be increased. The Commission may see these expressions as validation of its recent efforts to expand participation in evaluation teams. It should be noted that a majority of institutions responding were visited between three and five years ago.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF HOW PUBLIC COLLEGE CEO'S, FACULTY, AND TRUSTEES WOULD CHANGE THE COMPOSITION OF ACCREDITING TEAMS
(Percents)

	KEEP SAME			INCREASE			DECREASE		
	CEO	FAC	BD	CEO	FAC	BD	CEO	FAC	BD
Administrators	85%	48%	76%	7%	0	0	1%	36%	5%
Faculty	77	25	73	11	59	5	5	2	2
Support staff	69	52	61	22	27	18	3	5	0
Gov. Bd.	73	70	52	8	6	23	11	5	2
Four-year	51	47	48	9	25	14	30	9	16
Laypersons	51	45	43	6	16	5	35	16	23
State Sys. Staff	64	59	57	3	6	2	26	14	16
Student	59	44	46	6	31	18	23	6	9
Women	70	47	59	20	27	7	1	0	0
Minority	64	39	52	26	36	16	1	0	2

Private Colleges

Since the number of faculty and trustee responses from the private colleges was too small to be included, Table 20 presents a comparison of the responses of the CEOs from public and private colleges concerning satisfaction with team composition.

In the "Keep the Same" column every percentage is lower for the CEOs from the private colleges than are those of the public college CEOs. Those lower percentages indicate that the private college CEOs are less satisfied with accrediting team composition than are their counterparts from the public sector.

Private college CEOs would increase administrators, faculty, support staff, lay persons, state system staff, and students more than would the public college CEOs. However, private college CEOs would increase women and minorities considerably less than would the public college CEOs.

It would appear from the data that private college CEOs would prefer accrediting teams of a somewhat different composition than the public college CEOs. Those preferences probably are due to differences in funding, mission, governance, and curriculum. If those differences are significant, there is a possibility that team composition for the public and private colleges should differ.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The overall conclusion is that there is some dissatisfaction with team composition, perhaps greater in the private sector, but that given the nature of the process and the need for a broad representation of the segments within the limitation of prudent funding, it may be extremely difficult for the Commission to make additional changes in the composition of teams. The existing composition may well represent the optimum in the present circumstances.

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF HOW CEO'S FROM PUBLIC COLLEGES AND CEO'S FROM PRIVATE COLLEGES WOULD CHANGE THE COMPOSITION OF ACCREDITING TEAMS
(Percents)

	KEEP SAME		INCREASE		DECREASE	
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Administrators	85%	60%	7%	16%	1%	0%
Faculty	77	56	11	16	5	4
Support staff	69	40	22	24	3	8
Gov. Bd.	73	44	8	12	11	12
Four-year	51	36	9	0	30	24
Laypersons	51	32	6	16	35	20
State Sys. Staff	64	36	3	6	26	20
Student	59	36	6	8	23	20
Women	70	60	20	8	1	0
Minority	64	60	26	8	1	0

Competencies Desired on Evaluation Teams

The questionnaire included a question which asked respondents to identify specific competencies which should be included on evaluation teams. Only those comments by respondents were selected which included competencies not always included on accreditation teams. The initials at the end of each comment indicates the source. The following abbreviations were used:

Chief Executive Officer	CEO
Chief Academic Officer	CAO
Chief Student Services Officer	CSS
Chief Business Officer	CBO
Academic Senate President	AS
Member Board of Trustees	GB
Accreditation Liaison Officer	ALO
Self Study Chairperson	SSC

1. Special competencies for unique and special programs. SSC
2. Competency in the fiscal area. CAO
3. Learning resource specialist. CEO
4. Knowledge about the collective bargaining process. ALO
5. Experience is more important than team composition. CEO
6. Include someone who has expertise in educational planning. CEO
7. The principal competency needed is the ability to detect and investigate discrepancies between the self study and actual practice. AS
8. Someone who is capable of assessing staff satisfaction. AS
9. Someone who is competent to review curriculum standards.
10. Out-of-state, non-commission personnel. Everyone in California is a sweetheart. GB
11. Team members should have had experience with accreditation on their own campus. ALO/CAO

A number of responses indicated that the evaluation team needs to be selected to include persons who are qualified to evaluate the kind of institution that is being visited because each college has its own character and its own unique set of circumstances.

CHAPTER X: IS THERE CONGRUENCE BETWEEN THE AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE SELF STUDY AND THE TEAM REPORT?

Instructions to the chief executive officer of each college included in the survey asked that only one person who was most knowledgeable about the recent self study complete Part II of the survey instrument. Seventy-four responses were received from public colleges and 15 from private colleges.

Table 21 displays the public college responses indicating for each institutional element the percentage of respondents who reported that individual elements were cited as strengths or weaknesses in the self study and in the team report. To facilitate interpretation Table 22 displays only the elements identified as strengths by the self study and by the team report. The percentages are presented in decile ranges.

The percentages in the self study column appear to be slightly higher than those in the team report column but the ordering of the elements is remarkably similar.

Table 23 displays the elements identified as weaknesses by the self study and the team report. In this case, the percentages reported under the weakness column are lower than those reported under the team report column. However, as in Table 22, the ordering of the elements is also remarkably similar.

Tables 24 and 25 display the same data for the private colleges. Again, there is congruence between the self study and the team report and again the self study appears to be somewhat more positive than the team report.

There are some differences between private and public colleges in the ordering of the institutional elements in the team reports.

Public College Strengths	Private College Strengths
Competence of Faculty	Educational Leadership
Comprehensiveness	Competence of Faculty
Educational Leadership	Comprehensiveness
Educ. Prog. Community	Educ. Prog. Community
EOPS	Educational Planning
Business Management	Governance

TABLE 21

PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS WERE IDENTIFIED BY THE SELF STUDY AND/OR BY THE TEAM REPORT AS EITHER STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES
(Percents)

	SELF STUDY		ACCREDITATION REPORT	
	STRENGTH	REQUIRE CHANGE	STRENGTH	REQUIRE CHANGE
a. Goals and Obj.	49%	40%	38%	45%
b. Comprehensive	75	17	77	19
c. Ed. Prog. Comm.	69	17	63	27
d. Compet. Faculty	94	0	84	5
e. Educ. Leader.	66	15	64	20
f. Educ. Planning	35	55	22	70
g. Educ. Evaluation	34	54	31	63
h. Counseling Serv.	60	28	55	30
i. EOPS	72	14	61	25
j. Student Govt.	54	23	52	25
k. Community Serv.	49	34	41	45
l. Library	40	52	39	52
m. Learning Res.	48	37	45	38
n. Physical Facil.	45	45	52	39
o. Bus. Management	47	25	61	22
p. Financial Res.	40	51	44	41
q. Financial Plan.	34	49	36	48
r. Gov. Board	54	25	53	30
s. Governance	49	39	36	50
t. System/Dist.	29	23	25	27

TABLE 22

PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS WERE IDENTIFIED AS STRENGTHS IN THE SELF STUDY AND IN THE TEAM REPORTS
(Percents in Deciles)

Self-Study - Strengths	Team Report - Strengths
94 Competence of Faculty	
	84 Compet. Faculty
75 Comprehensiveness 72 EOPS	77 Comprehensiveness
69 Educ. Prog. Community 66 Educational Leadership 60 Counseling Services	64 Educational Leadership 63 Ed. Prog. Community 61 EOPS 61 Business Management
54 Student Government 54 Governing Board	55 Counseling Services 53 Governing Board 52 Student Government
49 Goals and Objectives 49 Community Services 49 College Governance 48 Learning Resources 47 Business Management 45 Physical Facilities 40 Library 40 Financial Resources	45 Learning Resources 44 Financial Resources 41 Community Services
35 Educational Planning 34 Educational Evaluation 34 Financial Planning	39 Library 38 Goals and Objectives 36 Financial Planning 36 Governance 31 Educational Evaluation
29 System/Dist. Relationships	25 System/Dist. Relationships 22 Educational Planning

TABLE 23

PERCENT OF PUBLIC COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS WERE IDENTIFIED AS WEAKNESSES IN THE SELF STUDY AND IN THE TEAM REPORT
(Percents in Deciles)

Self Study - Weaknesses	Team Report - Weaknesses
	70 Educational Planning
	63 Educational Evaluation
54 Educational Planning	52 Library
54 Educational Evaluation	50 College Governance
52 Library	
52 Financial Resources	
49 Financial Planning	48 Financial Planning
45 Physical Facilities	45 Goals and Objectives
40 Goals and Objectives	45 Community Services
	41 Financial Resources
39 Governance	39 Physical Facilities
37 Learning Resources	38 Learning Resources
34 Community Services	30 Governing Board
	30 Counseling Services
28 Counseling Services	27 Educ. Prog. Community
25 Governing Board	27 System/Dist. Relationships
25 Business Management	25 EOPS
23 System/Dist. Relationships	25 Student Government
23 Student Government	22 Business Management
	20 Educational Leadership
17 Comprehensiveness	
17 Educ. Prog. Community	
15 Educational Leadership	
14 EOPS	
	5 Competence of Faculty
0 Competence of Faculty	

TABLE 24

PERCENT OF PRIVATE COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS WERE IDENTIFIED AS STRENGTHS IN THE SELF STUDY AND IN THE TEAM REPORT
(Percents in Deciles)

Self-Study - Strengths	Team Report - Strengths
100 Goals and Objectives	
92 Comprehensiveness 92 Competence of Faculty 92 Educational Leadership 92 Educational Planning	92 Educational Leadership
	83 Competence of Faculty
75 Educ. Prog. Community 75 Goals and Objectives 75 Financial Planning	75 Comprehensiveness
68 Bus. Management 68 Governance	67 Educ. Prog. Community 67 Educ. Planning 67 Governance
58 Educ. Evaluation 58 Financial Res. 50 Community Services 50 Library 50 Physical Facil. 50 Gov. Board 50 Physical Facil.	58 Educ. Evaluation 58 Bus. Management 58 Financial Res. 58 Financial Planning 58 Gov. Board
42 Counseling Services 42 Student Govt. 42 Learning Res. 42 System/Dist. Relationships	42 Counseling Services 42 Student Govt. 42 Community Services 42 Learning Res. 42 System/Dist. Relationships
	33 EOPS
25 EOPS	

TABLE 25

PERCENT OF PRIVATE COLLEGE RESPONDENTS WHO REPORTED THAT INSTITUTIONAL ELEMENTS WERE IDENTIFIED BY THE SELF STUDY AND/OR BY THE TEAM REPORT AS EITHER STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES
(Percents)

	SELF STUDY		ACCREDITATION REPORT	
	STRENGTH	REQUIRE CHANGE	STRENGTH	REQUIRE CHANGE
a. Goals and Obj.	100%	0%	75%	25%
b. Comprehensive	92	0	75	17
c. Ed. Prog. Comm.	75	0	67	8
d. Compet. Faculty	92	0	83	8
e. Educ. Leader.	92	0	92	0
f. Educ. Planning	92	0	67	19
g. Educ. Evaluation	58	33	58	33
h. Counseling Serv.	42	17	42	25
i. EOPS	25	17	33	8
j. Student Govt.	42	17	42	25
k. Community Serv.	50	17	42	25
l. Library	50	50	25	75
m. Learning Res.	42	25	42	25
n. Physical Facil.	50	42	50	42
o. Bus. Management	67	25	58	25
p. Financial Res.	58	42	58	25
q. Financial Plan.	75	25	58	25
r. Gov. Board	50	25	58	17
s. Governance	67	8	67	8
t. System/Dist.	42	8	42	8

For the public colleges Educational Planning and Governance are high on the list of weaknesses. For the private colleges those elements appear to be strengths.

There are also interesting differences between the weaknesses reported in the team report.

Public College Weaknesses	Private College Weaknesses
Educational Planning	Library
Educational Evaluation	Physical Facilities
Library	Educational Evaluation
Governance	Counseling Services
Financial Planning	Student Government
Goals and Objectives	Community Services

Only two similar elements appear on this list--Educational Evaluation and Library. There appears to be congruence between the self study and the team report for both the public colleges and for the private colleges. There is much less congruence between the self study and the team report of the public colleges and the self study and the team report of the private colleges. The accrediting process appears to identify different institutional weaknesses and strengths in the two sectors.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

It appears from these data that for both the public and the private colleges there is significant congruence between the self study and the team report in the ordering of both institutional weaknesses and strengths. There is also an indication that the team report is somewhat less positive about institutional strengths and somewhat more negative about institutional weaknesses than is the self study.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In Chapter V reference was made to what appeared to be a relationship between the institutional elements which were most effectively addressed in the accrediting process and the elements which were perceived to have changed most frequently as a result of the team report. There also appears to be some relationship between those elements and the elements most frequently identified as institutional weaknesses.

Elements Most Effectively Measured	Elements Most Frequently Identified as Weaknesses in the Team Report	Elements which were Perceived to have Changed as a Result of the Team Report
Library	Library	Library
Goals & Obj.	Goals & Obj.	Goals & Obj.
Governance	Governance	Governance
Finan. Res.	Finan. Res.	Gov. Board
Phys. Facil.	Phys. Facil.	Ed. Prog. Comm.
Educ. Leader	Comm. Serv.	Educ. Leader
Educ. Plan.	Educ. Plan.	Educ. Plan.
Comprehens.	Educ. Eval.	Educ. Eval.
Bus. Manag.	Finan. Plan.	Finan. Plan.

The relationship between the elements identified as weaknesses and the elements perceived to have changed is particularly strong. It would appear that institutional change does occur as a result of the team visit and that it occurs most frequently in those elements identified in the team report as weaknesses.

The findings in this chapter provide further evidence that self study teams and accrediting teams appear to concentrate on a limited number of the institutional elements which were derived from the accreditation standards. As has been noted previously, that concentration could be the result of the manner in which the standards are presented in the accreditation manual or by the manner in which members of accrediting teams are trained or oriented or by the direction provided by the team chairperson. This concentration or standardization warrants further study and consideration by the Commission.

CHAPTER XI: COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS ABOUT ACCREDITATION

Far more comments and observations were submitted than could be practically included in this paper. Those that were selected were the ones which were deemed the most useful in reviewing and revising the accreditation process. In a few cases the actual wording was revised but every effort was made to preserve the original meaning and intent of the comment. The initials after each comment name the source as follows:

Chief Executive Officer	CEO
Chief Academic Officer	CAO
Chief Student Services Officer	CSS
Chief Business Officer	CBO
Academic Senate President	AS
Member of the Board of Trustees	GB
Accreditation Liaison Officer	ALO
Self Study Chairperson	SSC

This chapter will present first, selected general comments which were judged to be constructive; next, selected negative comments; and finally, selected positive comments. The positive comments, numbering over 80, were far more numerous than the negative comments and, in general, reflected great satisfaction with the accrediting process.

Selected General Comments

1. The guidelines for the self study per standard are a little too prescriptive. This results in a self study overkill. ALO/SSC

2. The concept of volunteer must be maintained. It must not allow evaluation/accreditation to become agency run/controlled. CEO

3. The process should be integrated with the college planning process. ALO/SSC

4. The increased emphasis on measuring student outcomes is important as changes in our institutions must come from within, not from outside. ALO/SSC

5. We received thirty-eight recommendations. The Commission should not allow that many. It dilutes the college's ability to address the few major issues that need to be addressed. CEO

6. The accreditation process is extremely important and should be strengthened to enhance the position of the community colleges as a vital part of higher education. The state should have no part in the process. CEO

7. Change the accreditation cycle from ten years to five years. Sign-off by the college president, academic president, and student body. AS

8. The key is the chairperson of the team. More care in the selection and training of chairpersons could improve the value of the process. CBO

9. It is very difficult to separate standards 9 and 10. Those standards should be reorganized into one with some subtopics, specifically referring to system relationships for multi-unit districts. GB

10. It is always difficult to get busy people to take on self study duties every five years. Perhaps an on-going model should be developed. CEO

11. The current framework of accreditation through ACCJC should be continued and proliferation of accrediting agencies should be avoided. SSC

12. Members should not be "old boy network friends" of top administrators who will avoid writing negatives that pertain to those administrators. Some team chairpersons (administrators) dismissed some faculty comments because they didn't want to have those things on their own campuses. SSC

13. A study of the British system of accreditation known as "Her Majesty's Inspection of Schools" might be beneficial. SSC

14. The value of lay persons, including trustees, on teams is questionable except under special circumstances. GB

15. Accrediting teams too often accept the self study at face value. Self studies require peers to judge peers which is a near impossible feat to accomplish. Outside of a few "Witch Hunts" there is too often a glossing over real issues that need attention. The accrediting team needs to have a strong agenda of pertinent and specific questions, tasks, expectations, and outcomes. SSC

Selected Negative Comments

1. I have reservations about the abilities of people to understand the uniqueness of other institutions. CSS/CBO

2. The costs (money and time) of accreditations appear to outweigh the advantages. How sad! The tough, relevant questions are rarely asked by accreditation teams. GB

3. Your prescriptive process of self-evaluation is so rigidly structured that it discourages creativity. ALO

4. It is my candid feeling (based on fairly extensive exposure to WASC) that a lot of "to do" is made at evaluation time and then the stuff sits there until next time. Oh, cosmetically, schools will claim "this and that" was adjusted, fixed, improved, as a result of the self study, but (1) how many of those are fixed as a result of the self study, and (2) how many are addressed as a result of professional people just doing their jobs? SSC

5. The time spent on campus by the visiting team is not sufficient. CAO

6. After putting in a year of hard work we all hoped to receive some beneficial feedback. Unfortunately, that was not the case. The recommendations were of little value to us in the enhancement of the institution. ALO

7. The accreditation process is unlikely to serve as an institutional self-improvement instrument because all the staff members have some inherent interest in helping the institution continue its accredited status. If some group other than WASC could develop an institutional self-improvement process, I believe that it would stand a chance of helping to effect a desirable change. . . . Overall, I would say that our most recent accreditation team did a fair-minded and excellent job. It noted both our strengths and our difficulties in a constructive and even-handed way. AS

8. I wish that I could think of a substantial programmatic problem that was identified and resolved because of the accrediting process. I know of no substantive examples. It is a requirement that institutions go through to achieve respectability and it is superior to state department licensure which is without merit or standards. I guess that is its primary value. AS

9. Rarely does an accreditation team have time to have intensive contact with faculty. Most faculty perceive the "good ole boy" network functioning to produce less than candid reports. I don't believe any organized attempt exists. I do believe there is a lack of critical perspective in some accreditation efforts. AS

10. Accreditation, as I have observed it, is a self-serving "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" process. I now place little confidence in the outcome and the report as a result. The self study process is the most useful aspect of accreditation. GB

Selected Positive Comments

1. Participation in the accreditation process, whether as a committee member preparing a self study or as a visiting team member is a very rewarding and enlightening experience. Accreditation is a valid way to keep our colleges on the right track. ACCJC officials are always very cooperative when colleges need assistance. AS/SSC

2. I am very appreciative of accreditation and the manner in which it is presently conducted. If offers our institutions the opportunity to measure themselves against the best and most comprehensive standards available to us and allows other wise and professional eyes to see what we are perhaps too intimately involved in to notice. CEO

3. Generally, the process works very well. I am always impressed that the institution and the visiting team come up with the same or similar conclusions and observations. I believe the process works. AS/SSC

4. In the three teams that have visited our campus and the six teams of which I was a member, I have never had a bad experience. In all nine cases the institution has benefitted as far as I am concerned. ALO/SSC

5. I have been impressed over the years with the professionalism and the talent of accrediting team members. Additionally, I believe in the process of self study and team review. CAO

6. I think the current process is critical to our well being even though it can be improved. The process is the only critical look we have by our peers--and in an environment free of political, governmental, and local bias. CEO

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. In my experience, accreditation teams have made a positive contribution to the operation and effectiveness of colleges. Sensitivity to local circumstances has been paramount along with commitment to generally held standards of community college education. I have not witnessed extraordinary transformations, but I do believe I have seen modest steps toward improvement which would be unlikely in the absence of the process. ALO

8. If all aspects of the system are looked at objectively, and with little bias, the results adhered to, with little deviation from suggested solutions, the accrediting process can be invaluable in maintaining a viable collegial atmosphere. ALO

9. My evaluations were based on our most recent accreditation which in the end was a positive experience. Faculty and staff pulled together ultimately to discuss the problems at hand. If there were things that did not make it into the self study, they were picked up by a concerned and listening accreditation team. AS

10. I continue to believe that the present system works well and that more often than not the process and exercise of preparing the self study helps a college to focus on where they are going and what needs to be done to get there. Accreditation by an independent, regional association has greater merit than a variety of other configurations presently under discussion. CEO

11. The Commission is the most effective means of accrediting our institutions. We should resist any efforts to establish another agency for this purpose. CAO

12. From my experience, the accreditation process is an integral part of the institution's vitality. I have always observed integrity in the process and concern for the institution's well-being. CAO

13. My experiences with accreditation have all been positive. I see the process as a means of validating what we are doing, or learning of the need for a change. Many changes have taken place at this institution due to accreditation recommendations. ALO

14. Accreditation by ACCJC is the most straightforward and useful activity sponsored by any professional association. CEO

15. The accreditation process is an excellent planning and validating tool. Colleges get as much out of it as they put into it. CEO

CHAPTER XII: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. What is the Nature of the Accrediting Experience of the Respondents?

   The public college respondents appeared to have more experience with the accrediting process than those of the private colleges. Only two faculty members from private colleges returned a usable questionnaire.

   Over 75% of the public college faculty respondents had been members of a college committee preparing a self study, and over half had participated in writing a self study.

   Public college administrators had considerably more experience with the accrediting process than all other segments--particularly with respect to chairing the accrediting team at another college.

2. Do the Self Study and the Team Report Effectively Identify Institutional Strengths and Weaknesses?

   Both the self study and the team report appear to be effective in identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses. Also, there appears to be a high degree of congruence when the percents reported by the respondents for the self study and the team report are placed in rank order.

3. Does the Accrediting Process Result in Significant Change in an Institution?

   There is strong evidence that the report of the accrediting team does result in institutional change. However, there appears to be a limited number of institutional elements which are more frequently perceived by the respondents to have changed and those elements appear to be much the same for all colleges.

4. What Attitudes are Held about the Accrediting Process?

   The attitudes the respondents hold about the accrediting process appear to be very positive. However, there are a few attitudes or perceptions about which the Accrediting Commission should be concerned. For example, approximately 40% of all respondents feel that the team reports infrequently result in negative actions by the Commission.

Respondents from the private sector appear to hold somewhat less positive attitudes about accreditation than do those from the public colleges.

5. Is the Accrediting Process Perceived to be Useful to the Institution?

   Although segmental differences do exist, the respondents report that the accrediting process is useful to an institution in several important ways.

   The private college respondents indicated that the accrediting process is less useful than those from the public colleges.

   There appears to be some evidence that perceptions of usefulness are directly related to experience with the accrediting process.

6. What Support Exists for the Application of the Accrediting Standards vs. the Institution's Own Goals?

   For both public and private college respondents there is indicated a slight preference for greater emphasis on the institution's own goals than on the accreditation standards.

7. Are the Respondents Generally Satisfied with the Composition of the Peer Evaluation Teams?

   The public college respondents appeared to be more satisfied with the composition of accrediting teams than the respondents from the private colleges.

   There appears to be a significant amount of dissatisfaction among the segments. A major part of that dissatisfaction appears to be from segments who do not feel they are adequately represented on teams or that another segment is better represented than they are.

8. Comments and Observations about Accreditation.

   The great majority of comments or observations were very positive. The negative comments related to "the old boys club," the "I'll scratch your back, you scratch mine" syndrome, and the self-serving nature of the self study.

9. Is there Congruence between the Self Study and the Team Report?

There appears to be substantial congruence between the elements identified as strengths and weaknesses in the self study and the team report.

There also appears to be some measure of congruence between and among the institutional strengths or weaknesses most effectively measured by the team report, those elements most often listed as institutional weaknesses in the team report, and those elements most frequently perceived to have changed as a result of the team report.

CHAPTER XIII: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose: To measure the impact of the accrediting process on institutional quality and integrity.

Name of respondent _____

Institution _____

Years of experience in a community or junior college _____

Position (check applicable line(s))

_____ Institutional Chief Executive Officer

_____ System or District CEO

_____ Accreditation Liaison Officer

_____ Academic Senate or Faculty Council President

_____ Chief Academic Officer

_____ Chief Student Services Officer

_____ Governing Board Chairperson

_____ Self Study Chairperson/coordinator

1. Please indicate the nature of your experience with the accrediting process. Check all that apply.

   a. I have chaired a college committee in preparation of the self study. [ ]

   b. I was a member of a college committee in preparation of the self study. [ ]

   c. I participated in the writing of the self study report. [ ]

   d. I have been a member of an accreditation team at another college. [ ]

   e. I have chaired an accreditation team at another college. [ ]

   f. I have participated in a specialized accreditation of a college program. [ ]

   g. I have served on a commission of a regional accrediting body such as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. [ ]

   h. I have attended a meeting of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. [ ]

   f. In connection with a course or program studied at a university or college I have had an opportunity to study the accreditation process. [ ]

   j. I have participated in an accreditation visit to a secondary school. [ ]

2. Please indicate by inserting percentages how much weight should be given to the minimum accreditation standards and how much to the institution's own goals.

Minimum accreditation standards	%
Institution's own goals	%
	100 %

3. Please indicate by circling a number in each line how effective you think the most recent self study of your institution was in identifying college weaknesses and strengths in the elements listed from a to p.

		Very Effective				Not Effective
a. The college goals and objectives.	a.	5	4	3	2	1
b. The educational program.	b.	5	4	3	2	1
c. Educational evaluation and planning.	c.	5	4	3	2	1
d. The student services program.	d.	5	4	3	2	1
e. The community services program.	e.	5	4	3	2	1
f. The college library.	f.	5	4	3	2	1
g. Other college learning resources.	g.	5	4	3	2	1
h. The physical facilities.	h.	5	4	3	2	1
i. Physical facilities planning.	i.	5	4	3	2	1
j. The college business management.	j.	5	4	3	2	1
k. The financial resources of the college.	k.	5	4	3	2	1
l. Financial planning.	l.	5	4	3	2	1
m. The functioning of the Board of Trustees.	m.	5	4	3	2	1
n. The role of the faculty and support staff in the governance of the college.	n.	5	4	3	2	1
o. The educational leadership provided by the administration.	o.	5	4	3	2	1
p. The relationship of the institution with the system or district (if applicable).	p.	5	4	3	2	1

6. Please indicate by marking an [X] in the appropriate box which of the elements from a to p the most recent accrediting team noted as requiring change or improvement.

a. The college goals and objectives.	a. [ ]
b. The educational program.	b. [ ]
c. Educational evaluation and planning.	c. [ ]
d. The student services program.	d. [ ]
e. The community services program.	e. [ ]
f. The college library.	f. [ ]
g. Other college learning resources.	g. [ ]
h. The physical facilities.	h. [ ]
i. Physical facilities planning.	i. [ ]
j. The college business management.	j. [ ]
k. The financial resources of the college.	k. [ ]
l. Financial planning.	l. [ ]
m. The functioning of the Board of Trustees.	m. [ ]
n. The role of the faculty and support staff in the governance of the college.	n. [ ]
o. The educational leadership provided by the administration.	o. [ ]
p. The system/district-college relationship.	p. [ ]

4. Please indicate by marking an [X] in the appropriate box which elements were noted in the most recent self study as needing change or improvement.

a. The college goals and objectives	a. [ ]
b. The educational program.	b. [ ]
c. Educational evaluation and planning.	c. [ ]
d. The student services program.	d. [ ]
e. The community services program.	e. [ ]
f. The college library.	f. [ ]
g. Other college learning resources.	g. [ ]
h. The physical facilities.	h. [ ]
i. Physical facilities planning.	i. [ ]
j. The college business management.	j. [ ]
k. The financial resources of the college.	k. [ ]
l. Financial planning.	l. [ ]
m. The functioning of the Board of Trustees.	m. [ ]
n. The role of the faculty and support staff in the governance of the college.	n. [ ]
o. The educational leadership provided by the administration.	o. [ ]
p. The system/district-college relationship.	p. [ ]

5. Please indicate by circling a number in each line how effective you think the accrediting team was in identifying strengths or weaknesses in the elements listed from a to p.

		Very Effective				Not Effective
a. The college goals and objectives.	a.	5	4	3	2	1
b. The educational program.	b.	5	4	3	2	1
c. Educational evaluation and planning.	c.	5	4	3	2	1
d. The student services program.	d.	5	4	3	2	1
e. The community services program.	e.	5	4	3	2	1
f. The college library.	f.	5	4	3	2	1
g. Other college learning resources.	g.	5	4	3	2	1
h. The physical facilities.	h.	5	4	3	2	1
i. Physical facilities planning.	i.	5	4	3	2	1
j. The college business management.	j.	5	4	3	2	1
k. The financial resources of the college.	k.	5	4	3	2	1
l. Financial planning.	l.	5	4	3	2	1
m. The functioning of the Board of Trustees.	m.	5	4	3	2	1
n. The role of the faculty and support staff in the governance of the college.	n.	5	4	3	2	1
o. The educational leadership provided by the administration.	o.	5	4	3	2	1
p. The system/district-college relationship (if applicable).	p.	5	4	3	2	1

7. Please indicate by circling a number in the appropriate lines in which elements from a to p institutional change occurred as a result of the report of the accrediting team.

		Very Effective				Not Effective
a. The college goals and objectives.	a.	5	4	3	2	1
b. The educational program.	b.	5	4	3	2	1
c. Educational evaluation and planning.	c.	5	4	3	2	1
d. The student services program.	d.	5	4	3	2	1
e. The community services program.	e.	5	4	3	2	1
f. The college library.	f.	5	4	3	2	1
g. Other college learning resources.	g.	5	4	3	2	1
h. The physical facilities.	h.	5	4	3	2	1
i. Physical facilities planning.	i.	5	4	3	2	1
j. The college business management.	j.	5	4	3	2	1
k. The financial resources of the college.	k.	5	4	3	2	1
l. Financial planning.	l.	5	4	3	2	1
m. The functioning of the Board of Trustees.	m.	5	4	3	2	1
n. The role of the faculty and support staff in the governance of the college.	n.	5	4	3	2	1
o. The educational leadership provided by the administration.	o.	5	4	3	2	1
p. The system/district-college relationship (if applicable).	p.	5	4	3	2	1

8. If in Question 7 you noted incidents of institutional change which you believe are the result of the accreditation process, please give a brief description of two of the outcomes, how they were accomplished, and by whom.

1. _____

_____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

_____

9. Check which of the following statements best reflect your opinion of the accreditation process.

a. The voluntary accreditation process is an effective procedure for the maintenance and enhancement of institutional integrity and quality. [ ]

b. The voluntary accreditation process is a somewhat effective procedure for the maintenance and enhancement of institutional integrity and quality. [ ]

c. The voluntary accreditation process is not an effective procedure for the maintenance and enhancement of institutional integrity and quality. [ ]

e. Institutional change is frequently the result of the accreditation process. [ ]

f. Institutional change is seldom the result of the accreditation process. [ ]

g. Accreditation reports seldom result in negative actions by the Accrediting Commission. [ ]

h. Accreditation teams frequently are negatively biased when visiting less traditional colleges. [ ]

i. The accreditation report sent to the Commission too frequently reflects the philosophy, attitudes, and opinions of the team chairperson. [ ]

j. The benefits of the accrediting process out-weigh the costs. [ ]

k. The orientation provided by the Commission to colleges about to be accredited is useful. [ ]

l. The composition of accreditation teams is generally appropriate. [ ]

10. With regard to the composition of the accreditation team, please check those items with which you agree.

a. The number of the following should be increased:

_____ administrators

_____ faculty

_____ support staff

_____ board members

_____ four-year college representatives

_____ laypersons

_____ state system staff

_____ students

b. The number of the following should be decreased:

_____ administrators

_____ faculty

_____ support staff

_____ board members

_____ four-year college representatives

_____ laypersons

_____ state system staff

_____ students

c. _____ Members of accrediting teams should receive a more thorough orientation to their duties and responsibilities.

d. _____ The number of members of minority groups on accrediting teams should be increased.

e. _____ The number of women on accrediting teams should be increased.

f. Please suggest any special competencies that should be added to accreditation teams:

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Institutional accreditation may be useful for several reasons, some of which are listed below. Indicate your opinion of the usefulness of each by circling the appropriate number.

	Extremely Useful				Not Useful
1. As a tool for self-evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1
2. As a system of peer review.	5	4	3	2	1
3. As a stimulus for improvement of programs and services.	5	4	3	2	1
4. As a means of demonstrating that an institution has standards that are generally recognized by the postsecondary community.	5	4	3	2	1
5. As a means of achieving or reinforcing consensus among the various elements of the college.	5	4	3	2	1
6. As a means of clarifying college and/or program goals.	5	4	3	2	1
7. As a criterion for eligibility for federal funds.	5	4	3	2	1
8. As a means of fostering in each participant a broader view of the goals, functions, and operation of the college.	5	4	3	2	1
9. As a means of developing or maintaining a collegial atmosphere in the college.	5	4	3	2	1
10. As a source of low cost consultation.	5	4	3	2	1
11. As an in-service experience for administrators, faculty and support staff.	5	4	3	2	1
12. As a means of increasing knowledge and understanding of the accrediting process.	5	4	3	2	1
13. As a means of developing an appreciation of the appropriateness and usefulness of the Standards for Accreditation.	5	4	3	2	1
14. As a means of developing an acceptance of the standards as being valid measures of institutional integrity and quality.	5	4	3	2	1
15. As a vehicle for career enhancement for active participants.	5	4	3	2	1

PLEASE RETURN TO:

ACCJC
P.O. Box 70
Aptos, CA 95001

ACCREDITATION IMPACT STUDY - PART II
1987

NOTE: SHOULD BE ANSWERED ONLY ONCE BY ONE PERSON SELECTED BY THE CEO.

Institution _____

In Column A please indicate with an [x] which of the following elements were noted in the most recent self study as strengths. In Column B please indicate which of the elements were noted in the most recent self study as weaknesses or requiring change.

In Column C please indicate which of the following elements were noted in the most recent accreditation team report as strengths. In Column D indicate which of the following elements were noted in the most recent accreditation report as weaknesses or requiring change.

	SELF STUDY		ACCREDITATION REPORT	
	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
	Strengths	Require Change	Strengths	Require Change
a. The college goals and objectives.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
b. The comprehensiveness of the educational program.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
c. The appropriateness of the educational program in terms of the community characteristics.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
d. The overall competence of the faculty.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
e. The overall competence of the educational leadership.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
f. The educational planning process.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
g. The educational evaluation process.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
h. The counseling services.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
i. Services to students with special needs.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
j. The student governance and activities program.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
k. The community services program.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
l. The college library and learning resources.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
m. Other college learning resources.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
n. The physical facilities.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
o. The college business management.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
p. The financial resources of the college.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
q. Financial planning.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
r. The functioning of the Governing Board.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
s. The role of the faculty, support staff and students in the governance of the college.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
t. The relationship of the institution with the system or district. (if applicable)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

u. Other (please specify) _____

_____

RETURN TO: ACCJC, P.O. Box 70, Aptos, CA 95001

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES JAN 20 1989